

A LETTER

TO THE

LORD BISHOP OF HURON:

IN

PERSONAL VINDICATION:

AND ON

THE INEXPEDIENCY

OF

A NEW DIOCESAN COLLEGE.

BY ADAM TOWNLEY, D.D.

PRESBYTER OF THE DIOCESE OF HURON, C.W.

"Let not then your good be evil spoken of."—Rom. xiv. 16.

"Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace."—Rom. xiv. 19.

BRANTFORD:

PRINTED AT THE COURIER OFFICE.

1862.

A PRAYER.

O Lord, we confess that we are much distracted, separated from one another, vexed with debates. Cleanse us of these sins; remove prejudices, discords, misunderstandings of one another, harshness, the spirit of controversy; give us forbearance and gentleness. Gracious Saviour, restore through Thy spirit, we entreat thee, true peace and oneness, not by concession of the truth, but by agreement in the truth, by the casting out of all errors and unsound doctrine,—specially those, on either hand, by which Thy Church in this age is peculiarly endangered,—by increase of true godliness and fervent charity. Let not Thy house in this colony be divided against itself, for we are brethren one of another, "Behold! see, we beseech thee, we are all Thy people," "Thou O Lord, art in the midst of us, and we are called by Thy name, leave us not." O Lord, send Thy blessings upon this branch of the vine; Thy workmanship; Thine own branch. Send Thy blessings, O Father, that we may be found an acceptable people in Thy sight, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

A LETTER TO THE LORD BISHOP OF HURON.

"That they also may be *one* in us, that the *world may believe* that Thou hast Me."—St. John xvii. 21.

PARIS, C. W., 12th June, 1862.

MY DEAR LORD BISHOP,

In your Address, just issued, respecting Trinity College, I find the following statements: "A clergyman of my diocese gave notice of a motion concerning Trinity College, which he proposed to bring forward at the meeting of the Synod in June, 1860. I now learn from the address of the Bishop of Toronto, to his Synod last June, which has been published and circulated in the country, that this clergyman *acted at the suggestion* of the Bishop of Toronto. I told this gentleman *before he proposed the resolution* that I was opposed to it, and would be against him! He, however, *persevered* in bringing forward the resolution in a speech, in which he passed the *highest eulogiums* on Trinity College. It was when the question of the College was thus, *contrary to my wish, forced upon the Synod* of my Diocese," &c., &c. Your Lordship again says, "such is the true history of the controversy which has taken place. It *originated* with the advice given by the Bishop of Toronto to one of my clergy, and the *determination* evinced by that gentleman to *force the question* before my Synod *contrary to my expressed wish*."

1. Now, my Lord, I cannot but feel pained that you should have deemed it right thus publicly, by the passages I have italicised, again to *imply* a severe censure upon myself, (for of course it is well known that I was the author of the resolution in question,) of which you have not thought it necessary to give me the slightest hint in *private*; especially do I regret these statements as they force upon me, the very unpleasant duty of also publicly defending myself against my Diocesan; of my repugnance to doing which your Lordship has already had proof. I am the more surprised that your Lordship's memory did not prevent your being betrayed into what, I must consider, very partial representations, as, upon seeing similar erroneous statements which appeared in the *Leader* shortly after the Synod alluded to, I immediately sent from England a plain

account of the facts to its Editor, and it is only quite lately that I again drew your Lordship's attention to it. The following is a copy of the letter, as it appeared in the *Leader* of 25th September, 1860.

"CANTERBURY, England, 28th Aug., 1860.

"SIR,—In *The Leader* of 30th July, which has been forwarded to me, I find in your remarks concerning the "Pastoral" of the Lord Bishop of Huron, the following statement:—"This opinion is not now uttered for the first time. It was promulgated at a meeting of the Synod, when a high-church Minister *disregarding friendly intimation*, challenged remark upon the subject!"

"As the individual who proposed the resolution upon which the Bishop's remarks were based, I feel called upon to deny the correctness of that portion of your statement which I have placed in italics. I do so because I would at once eschew the imputation of foolish indiscretion, or irreverently 'persevering' contrary to the expressed wishes of my Diocesan.

"The facts of the case, then, are these:—I have long been deeply convinced of the serious evils resulting alike to the Church and the cause of letters from that habit of establishing a host of feeble Diocesan Universities, into which the Church of the American Continent has unhappily fallen. I was therefore greatly desirous that Trinity College, Toronto, should be recognized as *the Church University* of at least Canada West. At the same time, so far was I from wishing to enforce one phase of theologic teaching, that I made several suggestions by which, as I trusted, the views of the Bishop of Huron might be met. Consequently, in December last, (I think it was) I brought a resolution *exactly similar* (1) to that which has been the immediate cause of this unhappy controversy before the Church Society of the Diocese of Huron, the Lord Bishop being in the chair, it was seconded by Dr. Caulfield, (a gentleman who certainly would repudiate the idea of being thought a 'high-church minister,') and passed *unanimously*, (2) *the Bishop not making the slightest objection.*

"Having, however, had it intimated to me by a distinguished individual, deeply interested in Trinity College, that to give the resolution weight, it should also be passed in our Synod. I sent due notice that I intended to bring it forward to the Executive Committee, which is of course 'presided over' by the Lord Bishop. It was printed by them along with other notices of business for the approaching Synod, and sent to every member, about a month previous to its meeting. In all this time I never received the

(1) The following is the first resolution as extracted from the Society's Book:—"December 9th, 1859. Moved by Rev. A. Townley, seconded by Rev. H. G. Caulfield, *Resolved*,—That seeing the great desirableness of having one efficient Church University in the Province, the Lord Bishop be respectfully requested to take such steps as to him may seem desirable, in order to receive (or secure) the confidence and hearty co-operation of Canadian churchmen, in support of Trinity College, Toronto."

(2) One Clergyman writes me that it, (the above resolution) was not "unanimous," for that he objected to it. I think he is mistaken. I perfectly well recollect that he remonstrated against the subject being brought up, but when the object was explained, and the resolution read, I feel *very confident* that he permitted it to pass without any further remark, and thus to be adopted "unanimously."

slightest hint from his Lordship that it would be undesirable to bring it forward; had he done so, I imagine he knows me well enough to believe, that I should at once have suppressed it; as I think it must be a very extreme case which makes it either wise, or right, to oppose one's Bishop.

"During the meeting of Synod, however, and just as the proper time had come in due course for bringing the resolution before it, the Bishop sent for me to speak to him, when I stepped up to his chair he whispered, 'I cannot support you in that resolution,' I replied, 'I am very sorry for it, my Lord, but I suppose it will be best to go on with it as the notice has been given.' He answered, 'O yes, certainly,' I can decidedly answer for the essential correctness of the above.

"In speaking to the resolution, I was careful as I had been in drawing it up, *not* to discuss the merits of Trinity College in its teaching, &c., but to confine myself to the one general question of the desirableness of his Lordship, (I quote the resolution) 'adopting such means as in *his wisdom he might see good*, as should tend to secure the hearty co-operation of all churchmen in support of *Trinity College, Toronto, &c., &c.*

"Further, immediately upon the Bishop's open opposition, *I begged leave to withdraw it*; I did so out of consideration to those of my Clerical Brethren, whom I had reason to suppose would desire to support it, as I had no wish to place them, by an action of mine on which they had not been consulted, in direct opposition to their Bishop; this, however, *His Lordship declined*, though in a very courteous manner, *to permit*.

"Surely, then, I am altogether clear from the possibility of any just imputation either of rashness or discourtesy; indeed, with my deep conviction of the sound Scriptural and Anglo-Catholic teaching by which Trinity College is distinguished, I cannot but think, that in the opinion of most men, I should certainly have been justified in speaking and acting much more decidedly."

"Yours, &c.,

"ADAM TOWNLEY."

2. I may further add to the above, that I called upon your Lordship the day before the resolution was brought forward, and still you did not give me the slightest intimation that you wished I would not do so; *nor indeed, did you ever express the slightest wish of the kind to me*. In fact, so far from it, that the impression made upon my own mind and that of others, from all the circumstances which transpired at the Synod, however erroneous our suppositions may have been, was that your Lordship was pleased to have such an opportunity for the full expression of your own views.

3. I cannot but feel still further, that your Lordship's recent address, also implies a censure both upon His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, and myself, for giving and receiving advice upon anything connected with your Lordship's Diocese, even though it concerned a matter in which that of Toronto was equally interested. I was one of those upon whom that venerable Prelate first laid holy hands in the sacred rite of Ordination, and was for nearly 20 years, one of his clergy; surely then it is no act of disloyalty to either my own Bishop or Diocese, to converse openly and freely with him on the general interests of the Provincial Church, or even to act upon a suggestion given in so truly Catholic a spirit.

4. Again, is it not taking a most singular view of this unhappy controversy, to assert that it "originated" with the Bishop of Toronto, because he suggested to one of your Lordship's Clergy, in a mere *casual* conversation, that a resolution which had been a short time previous unanimously accepted in your own Church Society, would be more influential for good if also adopted by our Synod? Or is it *just to me*, to intimate that I was a willing instrument in causing dissension, because I acted upon the suggestion; and not even then, without giving your Lordship a month's notice? Forgive me, my Lord, for asking whether the strong sentiment of disapprobation, as given in your Lordship's address, and expressed by yourself, sometime before my resolution, to the Lord Bishop of Toronto, "I cannot in my soul approve of the teaching of Trinity College," was not the much more probable occasion of lighting the torch of discord, than anything that could be done by so humble an individual as myself?

Now, my Lord, permit me most respectfully to ask, do I, under all the circumstances as here faithfully detailed, do I deserve to be charged by my Bishop before his Diocese, and in the face of the world, with having "perseveringly" and "determinately forced the question of Trinity College before your Synod, contrary to your expressed wish," and thus unnecessarily created disturbance in the Church? Knowing, my Lord, that this whole accusation is "baseless as the fabric of a vision," I cannot but feel that I have been bitterly wronged, and wronged where every conscientious presbyter has a right to look for support and protection; and, my Lord, I venture with all humility, to think that the reparation ought to be as public as the injury; more especially do I feel my righteous claim for open restitution, (and I think Christian gentlemen generally will see it in the same light,) when I remember the peculiarly courteous and respectful character of the resolution itself, as given in the note below. (*)

5. But your Lordship has also again stated that I passed the "highest eulogiums on Trinity College" in support of my resolution, notwithstanding my explicit statement to the contrary in the *Leader*. Now, such a charge I should not be careful to rebut, except that your recollection has failed you here also as to the facts, and that it implies a reflection upon my discretion to suppose that I would take such a course at that moment. The burden of my argument was the *disgrace* of Diocese immediately arraying itself against Diocese, and the *literary mediocrity*, or scarcely that, which must ensue if we attempted to inaugurate a number of Diocesan Colleges; at the same time I did allude to the success which had attended the College, and to the fact that *so far from the Provost being extreme in his personal teaching, I had heard complaints from the young men that they could not, on controverted points, get his individual opinions from him*. These are statements which it appears to me cannot be correctly characterized as "the highest eulogiums."

The foregoing defensive statements are necessary, my Lord, because the humblest ambassador of Christ may not needlessly permit his influence for good to be destroyed;

(*) "Moved by Rev. Dr. Townley, seconded by Rev. T. Ryall,—*Resolved*: That seeing it is greatly to be desired that the Canadian Church should unite in the upholding of one University, thereby ensuring for it a high literary character and extensive religious and church influence, this Synod respectfully requests the Lord Bishop to adopt such means as in his wisdom he may see good, as shall tend to secure the hearty co-operation of all churchmen in support of Trinity College, Toronto, which, through the energy of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, and the liberality of Churchmen here and at home, has been for some years in successful operation, and with the high honor of possessing a Royal Charter."

and I cannot but feel that, so far am I from deserving the animadversions in question, —unless indeed, it be altogether unlawful, in the Diocese of Huron, for any voice to be raised on behalf of Trinity College, though, in rights and property, *our own* institution!—there are few of your Lordship's Clergy who, in advocating the principle of one University, would have done so with equal, none with superior reverence for your sacred office, or with similarly respectful care, not heedlessly to oppose your personal wishes, or offend your prejudices. Nor do I believe your Lordship has another individual in your diocese who has already forborne as much, rather than disturb the peace of the Church of Christ therein.

And now, my Lord, to pass from mere personal considerations, if any vindication were necessary, of the course I pursued in this matter in 1860, I cannot but feel that it is amply afforded by the revelations recently made in the public papers concerning the steps already taken towards the establishing of a Diocesan College amongst ourselves. Permit me then, as one of your older clergy, to state respectfully yet plainly to your Lordship, and through you to the Diocese at large, what appears to me to be some of the fatal objections to such a scheme; as the additional light which has been thrown upon the question, will enable me, I think, to show much more fully than in 1860 that

A NEW DIOCESAN COLLEGE

is not desirable.

But permit me first, with due submission, to express my deep regret that matters should have been permitted to proceed so very far, before your Lordship has had the opportunity, at least officially, of consulting the views and wishes of your Diocese, concerning a project of such vast importance and intended permanency, and which must have so great an effect upon its well-being, either for good or ill; I am aware that it has been said, that a Theological Institution confined to candidates for Holy Orders is all that is contemplated. But even so, when it is to be upon so large a scale as to require \$80,000, the sum stated by Archdeacon Hellmuth, to set it properly afloat, and a House and Estate, worth \$20,000, are spoken of (though at a reduced price,) as a contemplated purchase; am I unreasonable, will the Clergymen and Laity generally think me so, in suggesting that it is a pity the thing has never been even mooted to us? May not many of them consider for instance, as I most certainly do, that it is very undesirable to educate our future Clergy on a system of isolation, apart from young men of their own age and standing? And the liberal scale of expense, for a Diocese so poor as ours, leads me of course to suppose that their entire scholastic, as well as theologic education, is contemplated. Now, this separation from that sympathy and intercourse, mental and social, with their fellows, which forms so important a feature of a complete and liberal education, has ever been counted as one of the most objectionable circumstances connected with the training at Maynooth, and as being one of the most disastrous in its results. I merely allude to this as an incidental evidence, that possibly your Lordship's Clergy and Laity may regret that they were not earlier consulted.

But whatever may be the *immediate* intention, I imagine from the magnitude of the preparations and the tone of the Archdeacon's speeches in England, that there can be no doubt that the design is, that the proposed College shall be, *ultimately* at least, *an* University; or, the expense it is proposed to go to, would surely, my Lord, be out of all

character;—it is viewing it in this light then, the same I see in which the Metropolitan regards it, that I proceed to state my fears respecting the evils resulting, should the intention unfortunately be carried out.

1. My first fear is that such a College would be of an *extremely partizan character*. Archdeacon Hellmuth has indeed given a pledge to his English friends, that it shall be so; promising that it shall be deeded *not to the Church of England as such*, but to *Trustees* belonging to a *certain party therein*; these are the Archdeacon's words in his letter to the *Echo*:—"I appealed to Evangelical men, and to such only, to aid in the establishment of a College to be avowedly Evangelical in its teaching, and that it is to be secured as such by Trustees!" Hence, it appears, my Lord, that the said College is not to be deeded, like our Churches, Parsonages, &c., to the *Church Society*, even of our own Diocese; that body is not to be trusted as sufficiently "Evangelical;" but to certain Trustees who have some standards of orthodoxy of their own, esteemed by them as more reliable than the Bible and the Prayer Book! Now, my Lord, I hope and believe, that when the Archdeacon thus insulted not only our own Diocese, but the very Church of God, he thoroughly misunderstood both the self-respect and the churchmanship of the Diocese of Huron, in supposing that its members would accept a College,—though its walls were of gold and its Professors sons of Solomon,—with the guardianship and management of which they were not thought worthy to be intrusted! Doubtless, the Archdeacon will find that, seeing the Great Head of the Church hath commissioned her, as teaches our 20th Article, to "be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," so the Diocese of Huron will not, on her part, entrust her holy places, whether Churches or Colleges, to any meaner keeping.

My Lord, have we not good reason to fear that a College started on principles such as these enunciated by the Archdeacon, would be most exclusively partizan? Why, my Lord, I give to the entire Prayer Book, services and articles, on honest *ex animo* assent and consent; I further, as a natural consequence, claim to be at least as "evangelical" in my doctrinal views and teachings as is the Archdeacon, if believing in and preaching Christ and Christ alone, or in the beautiful words of his quotation, used against us at Islington, an honest and earnest "determination not to know anything among men, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," be *evangelicalism*: and yet, because I do not believe in what I in my conscience consider as his Calvinistic (I use the term in no unkindness) abuse of the word "evangelical," I am therefore to be counted unworthy even to watch over the interests and well being of our own Diocesan Church institutions!

2. My next reason for suggesting whether it can be right under existing circumstances, to establish a new Diocesan College is that, to me, it appears to be *altogether unnecessary*; and my fear that it will, needlessly therefore, *tend to perpetuate unbrotherly feeling*, both amongst ourselves and between this and the other Dioceses.

(1.) You lately told us, my Lord, when statements were being made respecting the difficulty of obtaining Clergymen, that *that was not your trouble at present*, but rather the finding means to support them. Surely then, it cannot be wisdom to incur the enormous expense of commencing and maintaining a College, at all events at the present moment, when the claims of our mission field seem rather to demand that we should most carefully husband all our resources, whether Diocesan or from Home, for the support of those Clergy, or candidates for Orders, who, it appears, are ready, whenever your Lordship can find the funds to warrant you in employing them.

(2.) But even when these voluntary offers fail, and we have to educate a Diocesan Clergy for ourselves, we can certainly do so at far less expense, than by purchasing a costly building and estate at \$12000 or more, and supporting an efficient staff of Professors, for the comparatively few candidates, we can for long reasonably expect in our single and poor Diocese.

To leave for a moment Trinity College, Toronto, out of the question; why cannot our theological students be educated at Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada East, of which Dr. Hellmuth himself was for eight years a Professor? A few hours, and a comparatively trifling charge, would take them there; and more students than we shall find for some time to come, could, I imagine, be trained in that excellent institution, for less than the interest and current expenses connected with the building spoken of in London, alone; exclusive of the necessary costly array of Professors, &c. I do hope, my Lord, that our Diocese is not so puffed up with spiritual pride as to think itself too immaculate to have its Clergy educated by either Trinity College or Bishop's College!

(3.) Without doubt, however, the proper and legitimate College, so far as its intention and constitution are concerned, for our Diocese, as for the Church in Canada West generally, is TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO. Look at its constitution, my Lord; could anything be more open, generous, and catholic, or afford better security for its ultimate steady accordance with the principles and teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland; seeing that all the Bishops and Dioceses in Upper Canada have equal rights and power in its government, the appointment from time to time of its Professors, &c. And in this, even its enemies must admit that it stands in noble contrast, with the narrow and sectarian, not to say self-righteous, platform laid down by Archbishop Hellmuth, for the government of the College he is advocating!

I confess, my Lord, your last charges against the Trinity College have cheered me; for were they all that your Lordship's fears suppose them to be, they would amount to little, if anything, more than personal errors in judgment; nor do you attempt to speak of them as heresy. Is it then, my Lord, wisdom to rush, with a Diocese crippled as is ours, for the supply of its spiritual exigencies, into the enormous outlay of establishing another College, without first adopting temporary expedients, if need be, to meet our immediate theological training necessities; and then calmly and with dignity waiting to see, what time and the unwearied efforts of our own Diocese, with that of all "good men and true" in the others, would do towards setting matters right? But more especially would this seem to be the correct course, considering the remarkably open and conservative character of the governmental constitution of Trinity College, for sad indeed would be the day, when the majority of the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity in Canada West, should be so far fallen from plain Church-of-England doctrine, that there would not be wisdom and grace enough left amongst them to bring back one poor College to the right path! My Lord, were the Great Master thus to forsake His Church, she would not be worth remaining in.

But if it be really so difficult, as seems supposed, for the Church in the whole of Upper Canada to keep Trinity College right, *how much greater must be the danger to a mere Diocesan College*, especially when commenced for the avowed purpose of supporting party principles, and perpetuating them by a *close corporation trust*! thus, should error ever be found connected with it, making its return to Scriptural and Primitive Church doctrine, humanly speaking, impossible.

But again, when complacently contemplating the establishment of a new College, the immense sacrifice, both of property and *prestige*, we should be making in abandoning Trinity College, seems strangely forgotten. Trinity College, Toronto, is as *really and legally our Diocesan College*, as it is that of either Toronto, or Ontario; and, as I have before stated, *our rights therein are as full and co-ordinate as theirs!* It will be therefore very inexplicable to me, my Lord, should our Diocese be willing to resign its interest therein, for the sake of what must, at best, be a meagre partizan College, since it would be sustained only by our own influences, and on the suicidal principles, advocated by Archdeacon Heilmuth; the mystery of such a policy would be the more strange, as any evils, be they ever so real, from which Trinity College may be at present suffering, must, from the very nature of its constitution, be of a temporary character, unless, indeed, as some persons seem to fear, the Church herself is less to be trusted than individuals!

And besides, my Lord, I know that you are as fully aware as I can possibly be, of the almost necessary lowering of the literary and intellectual character of our Universities by their multiplication, especially in a new country like this. All that the Church, I should be ready almost to say in the whole of Canada, can reasonably hope to accomplish, is the sustaining of *one* University in such a state of complete efficiency in Arts, Divinity, Law and Medicine, as to command the respect of the continent; indeed to effect this much, the Colonial Church *as an unit*, would have greatly to exert itself; even if we should hereafter obtain a portion of the Provincial funds now enjoyed by "Toronto University." And it is in *such* an University alone, that I for one, would wish to see, whether for clerical or lay pursuits, our more liberally educated youth trained.

3. My third chief reason for very earnestly hoping that the Diocese may not be hurried into establishing another College of its own, whether it is to be exclusively theological or general; especially on any such large scale of expense as is spoken of,—is *that we are in no position to undertake so heavy an outlay*. You, my Lord, are often lamenting, and as we all know not without sad occasion, your utter inability to extend the ministrations of the Church where even the doors are open for their reception, because you have not the means to support the Clergy required; nay, even stating your fears lest you should be unable to retain the staff you now possess, inefficient as it is in number. Again, there is a distressing uneasiness on the minds of many concerning the future maintenance of our junior clerical brethren. They can scarcely now live upon their slender pittance; and how, as their families grow up, they are respectably to educate and provide for them, their Master only knows. And yet further, another of our godly fore-lookings is, from whence are our ranks as we are called away, to be replenished? Certain it is that young men of the right stamp are *not* forthcoming. God works by means, peculiarly so, where His Church is already in full operation; and there is so total a lack of any thing approaching an assured income, of even the most moderate description, that our youth require an almost apostolic zeal to face the consequent trials of our colonial priesthood, while their parents need to have a vision, well nigh clear as that of St. Paul, of the glorious reward awaiting a faithful ministry, before they can be expected to advise their sons to make the present sacrifice.

Now, with such various crying needs in our midst, can your Lordship, while feeling their urgency more deeply perhaps than any of us, blame us if we hesitate in thinking it right to appropriate \$50,000 to a local Diocesan College? More particularly seeing the little need there is for it, as I think I have shown, nay, the positive evils likely to

result therefrom. Such an amount if invested, would yield an annual revenue of some \$6,400, a sum sufficient to maintain *sixteen* additional Missionaries at the present rate of \$600 per annum to each, supposing, as your Lordship generally expects, that their missions paid one third of their salaries; or it would greatly aid in the important object of forming a Diocesan Endowment Fund, for the purpose of giving some security to the incomes of the Clergy as they attained maturity in their work.

4. And now, in concluding this long letter, forgive me, my Lord, if, being one of your senior presbyters, I implore you with all respect, but with all Christian earnestness, deeply to consider, or ever you finally gave your sanction to the new College in question, the grievous effect, it would needs have upon the *unity*, the inward unity of the Church at large in this colony,—that unity of His people so dear to the heart of our common Master! Yea, even though it should be only a Theological Institution that is at present intended; especially, as seeing the magnificent scale upon which it is attempted, men will think that it is designed, at least by some parties, to be ultimately an University. What, my Lord, after the bitter controversy concerning Trinity College, and the arguments openly adduced by Archdeacon Hellmuth, and his friends, for establishing a new one, * endorsed as such sentiments would then be, by your Lordship and your Synod, what I ask, would the establishing of such a Diocesan College be, but the placing of the rest of the Church in Canada, on the ground that she is unsound in the faith, under the *ban* of the Diocese of Huron? Do we start at the bare idea of such fearful presumption? Then, my Lord,—for as it appears to me, matters have gone too far for any middle course—the College as advocated by the Archdeacon, *must be abandoned*; otherwise I tremble with fear lest the sin of a terrible, a causeless, breach in the *unity* of the Church of the living God, drawn together as she is by the bands of the love of Christ, as with “the cords of a man,” should rest upon our unhappy Diocese. May God forbid!

Again, trusting that your Lordship will pardon my urgent, though, as I hope, not disrespectful appeal,—for “is there not a cause?”

I remain, my dear Lord Bishop,

Faithfully, your obedient servant,

ADAM TOWNLEY, D. D.,

Incumbent, Paris, C. W.

* The following is a specimen of what it is surely right to call the *unchristian*, and therefore strife prompting, presumption of the Archdeacon in judging his Brethren of the Canadian Church generally, when publicly advocating his project for a new College:—

“He could not hide it, he must speak out the truth, that Evangelical men are at a very great discount in those colonies generally.”

“He trusted as this is the very first effort of the kind to establish a thoroughly Protestant Theological College in the colony, Evangelical men will effectually help this good cause.” Speech of Archdeacon Hellmuth at the Clerical Meeting at Islington.—*Record*, Jan 22, 1862.

Is it possible then, that those who would sincerely follow the Apostolic injunction to “seek peace and insure it,” can support an institution whose very basis is thus an open violation of the charity that “hopeth all things,” and “thinketh no evil?”